

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 30, 2008.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 30, 2008, Claims 1-84 were pending and Claims 85-90 were withdrawn. In the Office Action, Claims 29-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because the claimed invention may be directed toward non-statutory matter. Claims 1-28 and 57-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-8, 11-16, 19-36, 39-44, 47-64, 67-72 and 75-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gong (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0064733). Claims 9-10, 37-38, and 65-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong, as applied to Claims 1, 29 and 57 above, in view of Loveland et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0163515, hereinafter Loveland). Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong, as applied to claims 1, 29, and 57 above, and further in of Jhingan et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0186851, hereinafter Jhingan).

II. Summary of Applicants Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1, 29 and 57, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-84. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action mailed July 30, 2008, Claims 29-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter. The present Response hereby amends independent Claim 29 so as to more clearly define the statutory subject matter of the embodiment therein. Applicant respectfully submits that, as amended, Claim 29 and its dependent Claims 30-56 now comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action mailed July 30, 2008, Claims 1-28 and 57-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The present Response hereby amends Claims 1 and 57 to more clearly define the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that as amended, Claims 1-28 and 57-84 now comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed July 30, 2008, Claims 1-8, 11-16, 19-36, 39-44, 47-64, 67-72 and 75-84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gong (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0064733).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

*1. A method for sharing files with remote users, the method comprising:
accepting, at a proxy server, a request from a file sharer to share a file with a remote user, the file located at a file source;
accessing credentials that enable the proxy server to access the file at the file source;
generating a proxy representation for the file on the proxy server, the proxy representation associated with the remote user and storing location information of the file on the proxy server;
receiving one or more modifications to the proxy representation; and
updating the file located at the file source based on the modifications to the proxy representation received at the proxy server by using the location information.*

As amended, Claim 1 defines a method for sharing files by creating proxy representations of these files on the proxy server. When the proxy server receives a request to share a file, it first accesses the credentials that enable access to the file. Once it accesses the file, the proxy server generates a proxy representation of that file on the proxy server. This proxy representation is associated with a remote user and it stores location information needed to access the original file.

Subsequently, some modifications can be made to the proxy representation on the proxy server. Once these modifications are made, the original file at the file source is updated based on the modifications received to the proxy representation at the proxy server. This can be done by using the location information.

One advantage of such functionality is that users are allowed to securely share files with other remote users which are outside of the local network via the use of the proxy server. Thus, rather than having to send separate copies (e.g. attachments) to the remote user, the remote user is instead allowed access to the proxy representation. When the remote user makes changes to this proxy, those changes can then be automatically updated to the original file located on the file source. In this manner, the remote users are allowed true synchronized sharing of the original file, rather than transmitting multiple copies amongst each other and keeping track of the different versions of these multiple copies.

The Gong reference teaches concurrent version control and information management of files sent as attachments through email. More specifically, an information management server (IMS) is described which keeps track of multiple versions of attachments mailed to multiple users. Thus, when a user sends an attachment, the IMS creates one master copy of the attachment and manages all the check-in, check-out and modification activities by the different users that have access to that attachment (Gong, par. [0009]). In this manner, the IMS keeps track of the many versions of the attachment that is accessed by multiple users.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Gong fails to anticipate the features of Claim 1, as amended.

Specifically, Gong fails to disclose updating the original file located at the file source based on the modifications to the proxy representation received at the proxy server, as defined in amended Claim 1. This functionality allows a user to access and edit a proxy representation of a file and have the changes be updated back to the original file (at the file source). No such functionality is disclosed in Gong. Instead, Gong merely discloses the ability of users to modify the attachment and to keep track of the different versions of that attachment. As such, Gong does not disclose updating the original file based on the modifications received to the proxy representation, as defined in amended Claim 1.

Moreover, Gong also fails to disclose the step of accessing credentials that enable the proxy server to access the file at the file source, as defined in amended Claim 1. Instead, Gong

appears to describe requiring login authentication from users that access the interface (“users can access the Client Project/Information Management Web Interface to manage attachment information (login authentication is needed).” Par. [0020]). However, this function merely authenticates a user. This is different from the features defined in amended Claim 1. In amended Claim 1, the credentials enable the proxy server to access the file at the file source. This can also allow the proxy server to update the file with the modifications received at the proxy representation, as discussed above. Gong would appear to have no use for such functionality since it does not disclose updating the original shared file in this manner.

In view of the above comments and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 29 and 57

Claims 29 and 57, while independently patentable, recite limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to Claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8, 11-16, 19-28, 30-36, 39-44, 47-56, 58-64, 67-72 and 75-84

Claims 2-8, 11-16, 19-28, 30-36, 39-44, 47-56, 58-64, 67-72 and 75-84 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8, 11-16, 19-28, 30-36, 39-44, 47-56, 58-64, 67-72 and 75-84 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed July 30, 2008, Claims 9-10, 37-38, and 65-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong, as applied to Claims 1, 29 and 57

above, in view of Loveland et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0163515, hereinafter Loveland). Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong, as applied to claims 1, 29, and 57 above, and further in view of Jhingan et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0186851, hereinafter Jhingan).

Claims 9-10, 17-18, 37-38, 45-46, 65-66 and 73-74 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 9-10, 17-18, 37-38, 45-46, 65-66 and 73-74 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 29, 2008

By: /Justas Geringson/
Justas Geringson
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928